

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

**PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF
OREGON, et al.,**

No. 3:16-cv-00109-PK

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

BARBIE DOE, et al.,

Defendants.

MOSMAN, J.,

On October 31, 2016, Magistrate Judge Paul Papak issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [50], recommending that Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss [12] should be GRANTED, Plaintiffs’ Motion for Protective Order [17] should be DENIED, and Plaintiffs’ Motion for Judgment [43] should be DENIED. Judge Papak also recommended that Plaintiffs’ “First Criminal Complaint on Information” [17-1] and “Original Title 18 Criminal Complaint” [18-1] should be DISMISSED. Plaintiffs’ filed their Objections to the F&R [56] on December 6, 2016.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge,

but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Papak's recommendation and ADOPT the F&R [50] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 9th day of February, 2017.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge